

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 15-24 were pending of which Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9 were rejected, Claims 3-5 and 8 were objected to and Claims 15-24 were allowed. Claim 1 is amended.

Applicants note that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed on June 30, 2004, and that Applicants have not yet received the Examiner's initialed form PTO-1449, which was submitted therewith. Applicants request that the Examiner initial and return the PTO-1449 form attached to the June 30, 2004, Information Disclosure Statement, to indicate that the information has been considered and made of record.

Applicants also wish to make it of record that the documents cited in the June 30, 2004, IDS were brought to the Applicants attention in an Ex Parte Reexamination filed by another for U.S. Patent 6,320,609 (Reexamination Control No. 90/006,879). Applicants point out that a Terminal Disclaimer was filed in the present case to overcome a double patenting rejection over U.S. Patent 6,320,609. A Notice of Intent to Issue Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate was issued on January 26, 2005, confirming all claims without amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng (5,546,179) ("Cheng"). Applicants request reconsideration.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "moving the optical system to follow the edge of the wafer and locate an alignment feature on the edge of the wafer while the wafer is held linearly and rotationally stationary on the fixed station". Support for the amendment to Claim 1 may be found, e.g., at page 3, lines 16-19. Applicants submit that the amendment merely makes explicit what was always implicit in the claim by the term "fixed station" and thus does not narrow the claim. Nevertheless, the amendment is made in order to expedite prosecution.

Cheng discloses that the wafer 22 is held on a rotatable chuck 16. Col. 5, line 15. Accordingly, Cheng does not disclose holding the wafer "linearly and rotationally stationary on the fixed station" as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Cheng. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 7 and 9 depend from Claim 1 and are, therefore, likewise patentable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Elliott et al. (5,669,979) ("Elliott"). Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. Elliott does not make up for all the deficiencies of Cheng. See, e.g., col. 20, lines 66-67 and col. 21, lines 1-4. Accordingly, Claim 2 is patentable over the combination of Cheng in view of Elliott for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.


Claims 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Hampton (4,794,238) ("Hampton"). Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 6 depends from Claim 1. Hampton does not make up for all the deficiencies of Cheng. Accordingly, Claim 6 is patentable over the combination of Cheng in view of Hampton for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended and Claims 1-9 and 15-24 remain pending. For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1-9 and 15-24. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8202.

**Via Express Mail Label No.
EV 450 194 203 US**

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Halbert
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,633

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP

2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210